

Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project (DIFT)
Scoping Meeting
June 4, 2003, 10:00 a.m.
Northwest Activities Center, Detroit

Purpose: This is the second part of the formal scoping meeting on the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project, the first part having been conducted on September 19, 2002. Its purpose is to familiarize agencies and those with permitting and regulatory authority about the purpose and need and alternatives for the DIFT Project and to familiarize those in attendance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process.

Attendance: See attached list.

Discussion:

Welcome/Introductions

Mohammed Alghurabi opened the meeting and noted that a tour would be conducted directly following the scoping discussion. He also indicated Arabic and Spanish translators were available. He provided a brief introduction of the project and indicated Greg Johnson of the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) would serve as moderator of the meeting. Mr. Johnson began by asking for introductions and by describing how the meeting would be conducted. He introduced Don Cameron of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to provide an overview of the NEPA/EIS process.

NEPA/EIS Presentation

Mr. Cameron explained the NEPA/EIS process. He noted the role of public involvement; the alternatives and impacts covered by an EIS; the conduct of a public hearing on the Draft EIS;

and, the preparation of the FEIS, including a recommended alternative and the Record of Decision. He then opened the floor to questions regarding his presentation.

NEPA/EIS Questions

Question: What is the timeline for the project?

Response: The Draft EIS is scheduled for completion in summer 2004. Within a year from then, the Record of Decision (ROD) should be complete.

Q: How does federal funding relate to the ROD?

R: The ROD is the last step in developing the Final EIS. Design of the project cannot begin until the Record of Decision is complete. The Record of Decision could result in doing nothing at all.

Q: Does NEPA require that all state and local regulations and rules be met?

R: Yes.

Q: Does the County have to sign off on the Record of Decision?

R: The first decision is made by MDOT. If MDOT does something without concurrence of what agencies think, that can sometimes create problems. I think in the Detroit area, the case we're looking for is concurrence of the major portion of the metropolitan area and once the individual city by itself is saying "we object", it may not be enough to cross it out.

Project Overview

Joe Corradino provided background on the project, its purpose and need, and potential issues. He defined what intermodal is and the nature of its recent growth. He noted where the terminals are in Southeast Michigan today and are expected to be in the future and the capacity of each. He referred to earlier analyses conducted by another team and indicated that current demand is in line with the earlier forecasts. He then briefly described the DIFT alternatives, indicating that Alternative 1, No Action, has already had involvement with state money and this is the background situation. Alternative 2 was developed partly in response to comments by Communities for a Better Rail Alternative (CBRA) to expand/improve each existing terminal at its current site rather than consolidate at one site. Alternative 3 is the consolidation at one site and that place is the Livernois-Junction Yard.

Analysis of the existing Livernois-Junction Yard shows that although the site is large, it is cut by Central and Lonyo Avenues. It would be more effective if one of these streets would be closed and the other likely put under the rail platform.

CP/Expressway, which is located to the east of the Livernois-Junction Yard, is soon to experience a reduction in its space due to the cancellation of a lease. It could also be affected by a proposed conversion of two railroad tunnels to use by trucks and building a new rail tunnel under the Detroit River, which would emerge in the vicinity of the CP/Expressway terminal. Joe Corradino noted, however, that fitting the tunnels and the expanded CP/Expressway terminal in the area behind the MC Depot is problematic at this point.

Regarding the CP/Oak Yard, Joe Corradino noted it would likely be expanded to the north, if expansion occurred. The terminal is operated by CP but on property leased to it by CSX.

At the CP/Moterm terminal, expansion may go into the industrial area on the east or it may go south into the state fairgrounds.

Alternative 2 involves expanding existing terminals and would likely require acquisition of land at each location with the possible exception of Livernois-Junction Yard. Alternative 3 (Consolidation) would require right-of-way acquisition at Livernois-Junction Yard.

Joe Corradino stressed there are two important needs to be addressed by the project: capacity versus demand and connectivity. He reviewed analyses indicating that demand for intermodal services outstrips the ability of the capacity of the existing terminals. He noted that both the capacity and demand forecasts for each terminal were reviewed by representatives of the railroad operating the terminal. He noted the forecasts for 2025 in the DIFT Purpose and Need Statement were lower than earlier projections prepared by others. And, the new forecasts were presented in a range rather than a single number. The higher end of the range is consistent with growth trends provided by the Intermodal Association of North America and the American Trucking Association. The forecast at the low end of the range is based upon Reebie data, which show growth in intermodal traffic in Wayne County to 2010 at about 2.6 percent per year, compounded. That forecast was extended to 2025. Joe Corradino stressed that, regardless of the low or high end of the forecast range, the capacity of existing terminal facilities is exceeded by at least 75 percent. He also noted that even if the Triple Crown and Delray terminals continued to be used for intermodal business, the system of terminals would not have the capacity to meet the demand.

Joe Corradino noted other projects in the region, in terms of major infrastructure development, to which connections are needed to do a good job in moving intermodal freight.

Joe Corradino discussed a number of key issues related to the project, in particular economic impacts, environmental justice and air quality. On air quality, he noted that for the EIS, there would be a CO hot-spot analysis; ozone analysis, sufficient to determine conformity for the years 2015 and 2025; and, a qualitative assessment of air toxics. Economic impacts would be developed for the local area around each terminal, the rest of Wayne County and the rest of the region.

Interaction

Representatives of groups that came to the meeting were asked to make comments. This was done by moving clockwise around the conference table set up for the meeting.

?? Sherry Kamke of EPA had no comments at this time.

?? Doug Topolski of the Dearborn Police Department expressed concern about traffic impacts on Michigan Avenue. Joe Corradino noted that an intersection analysis would be done indicating the level of service. This analysis would include existing (background) traffic and new intermodal truck traffic. The Dearborn representative also noted the issue of hazardous waste.

?? Glenn Osowski of Congressman Conyers' office asked how the project was being coordinated with Homeland Security agencies due to the fact that the DIFT was located at an international border location. He also asked whether the new crossing itself was vital to the DIFT. Joe Corradino responded the DIFT Project Team had met with Wayne County and Detroit Homeland Security personnel. The DIFT Project is being coordinated with the Border Crossing study. And, while the location of a new crossing is now unknown, the DIFT was largely independent of border issues. Finally, Joe Corradino noted that coordination has also occurred within the Canadian Pacific study that is examining the use of the existing rail tunnels under the Detroit River for potential truck commerce.

?? Colonel Lundy of the Michigan Department of Military Affairs had no comment at this time.

?? Robert Sills, an MDEQ Air Quality Division representative, asked about the air quality analysis at the terminals which would have intermodal traffic moved if consolidation occurred. Joe Corradino responded that the analysis assumed that those terminals from which intermodal traffic would be shifted would continue to be used for some rail-related function and this would be covered in the analysis of the indirect and cumulative impacts.

?? Jerry Fulcher, an MDEQ representative, noted the \$10 million to be invested in the Livernois-Junction Yard and asked whether this investment affected the outcome of the

EIS. Joe Corradino responded that this investment would be reflected in the base (i.e., No Action) condition as is ordinarily done in EISs.

?? Robert Johnson of Michigan Consumer & Industry Services noted that the TEA-21 reauthorization was coming and wondered how the project fits into that reauthorization. Mohammed Alghurabi noted that MDOT, working with the Michigan Congressional Delegation, has provided input to the reauthorization requests for additional funding of the DIFT. Joe Corradino added that regardless of the DIFT project outcome, transportation legislation covering the next several years will have a strong emphasis on freight movement.

?? Fred Berry of Wayne County Homeland Security asked how much HAZMAT would be handled by DIFT and the kind of communication the DIFT Project has on that issue with Wayne County and similar agencies/communities. Joe Corradino responded that less than one percent of intermodal freight is related to hazardous materials and that, generally speaking, the nature of hazardous material includes items like auto paint. He further noted that the DIFT Project Team had met with Mr. Slaughter of Detroit's Homeland Security agency and Mr. Shannon of Wayne County Homeland Security. Finally, the DIFT Project Team had made contact with federal Homeland Security officials and hoped to meet in December when they say they will be available.

?? Karen Dumas of Mayor Kilpatrick's Office asked:

~~Q~~ What was the public reaction to the project?

~~Q~~ Had there been feedback from the Port Authority?

~~Q~~ Who sat on the Local Advisory Council?

Joe Corradino responded that he would ask Mr. Alghurabi to address the first question. On involvement of the Port Authority, he noted its representative has testified in Lansing in support of the DIFT project. But, the DIFT Project is not planning on a link to the Port. On the Local Advisory Council, Joe Corradino indicated the list of 50+ persons on the Local Advisory Council would be provided to the Mayor's office.

Mohammed Alghurabi noted, in response to the question on public reaction to the project, that the best answer would come from the community. But, he stated his opinion that there had been a lot of professionalism in the interaction with the community. He indicated that MDOT has learned quite a bit and is doing the best it can. Mohammed Alghurabi noted that the Local Advisory Council is a community-based group with a good cross section.

Joe Corradino remarked that Alternative 2 basically grew out of public involvement. He also noted he had recently met with four local groups (Grandmont, Grandmont I, Rosedale Park and South Jeffries) and that the interaction had been positive. The president of the local business association in that area (CP/Oak) has joined the Local Advisory Council.

?? Ken Dobson of Congresswoman Carolyn Cheeks-Kilpatrick's office asked whether asthma would be addressed by the air quality analysis. Joe Corradino responded that the DEIS would include some modeling of PM_{2.5}, the results of which would be

published in a separate document. The data from that analysis could be used to judge the relative effects of different alternatives on asthma hospitalizations through the use of data provided by the Michigan Community Health Department. However, he stressed the EIS would not include a health risk assessment. It will deal with issues like asthma and air toxics on a qualitative basis.

?? Chuck Tucker of Ferndale had no comments at this time.

?? Bruce King of the Detroit Department of Environmental Affairs noted that diesel exhaust comprises 36 percent of $PM_{2.5}$ so some analysis of $PM_{2.5}$ should be included in the study. Joe Corradino responded that FHWA will follow the conformity rules, which do not now cover $PM_{2.5}$ or air toxics. If the rules change, then the analysis of those pollutants will be included in the EIS. Bruce King then asked that he be provided with information related to these issues. Joe Corradino indicated that it would be provided. Don Cameron of FHWA indicated that EPA had not designated non-attainment areas and methodologies to use for $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10} or air toxics. So, FHWA is using an alternative approach.

?? Paul Max of the Detroit Health Department asked why a health risk assessment would not be done. Joe Corradino responded that no rules have been established nor methodologies confirmed for such an analysis. He offered one example of one undefined issue as the mix of fuels to be used to generate air quality emission factors for diesel engines.

?? Donald-Ray Smith of the Detroit Planning and Development Department asked if the environmental justice (EJ) analysis applies to all terminal sites. Joe Corradino noted that EJ effects for each terminal site would be addressed in the EIS.

?? Wayne County Public Services representatives had no comments at this time.

?? Heidi Alcock of the Detroit Planning Commission indicated a positive reaction to including Alternative 2 in the DIFT EIS, but expressed concern that the impacts of expansion on any particular site may cause elimination of the entire Alternative 2. It was recommended, then, that a backup site be examined to fill this gap. Joe Corradino indicated that the explanation of the use of other potential sites, such as Highland Park, would be covered in the EIS.

?? Kathryn Savoie of ACCESS and CBRA questioned the Purpose and Need Statement by indicating that Norfolk Southern's decision to shift Triple Crown and Delray intermodal business to the Livernois-Junction Yard allows a private corporation to shape public policy. Also:

~~✍✍~~The benefits from the project need to be separated from the mitigation measures.

~~✍✍~~The Arab community is a distinctly recognized minority in the state of Michigan and needs to be included in the Environmental Justice analysis.

~~✍✍~~The planned PM_{2.5} analysis is inexcusable.

~~✍✍~~The exclusion from the environmental impact analysis of a health assessment is unacceptable.

?? Olga Savic of State Representative Tobocman's office stated that the Livernois-Junction Yard manager indicated paving would double capacity. Also:

~~✍✍~~ There seems to be two issues: one, untying "knots" in the rail system, and the second getting more land at individual terminal sites. If the "knots were untied," would that solve the capacity need?

~~✍✍~~ It appears that the alternatives process had already been established and wondered about other alternatives with respect to Moroun's (Riverview-Trenton Railroad) terminal and the use of greenfields.

~~✍✍~~ How will community cohesion be evaluated? What sort of model be used? Is there a model that lists the factors the community cares about?

In response, Joe Corradino noted that paving the Livernois-Junction Yard was part of the plan with Alternatives 2 and 3; the railroads are not likely to undertake this by themselves under Alternative 1. Further, the "knots" need to be fixed under either Alternatives 2 or 3 to make the system work. Third, greenfields are not an option for the consolidation alternative. That had been looked at before and determined not to be prudent. Finally, there is no model, as such, that will be used to address community cohesion. In past analyses, this issue has been addressed by examining population characteristics, separation of neighborhoods from schools, parks and other community facilities by a transportation improvement, and analysis of similar issues.

?? Karen Kavanaugh of CBRA and the Southwest Detroit Business Association noted several points:

~~///~~There should be clarification that the project would primarily benefit the auto companies.

~~///~~What level of public financing would be required?

~~///~~What would be the specific economic benefit for facilitating the movement of freight to the City of Detroit as opposed to the region?

~~///~~What would the economic benefits be to the host communities?

~~///~~What is the increase in truck traffic, not only in Southwest Detroit, but also on Detroit freeways and neighborhoods?

~~///~~What impacts would there be on future land use and development?

~~///~~What impacts would there be on existing projects and public investments?

~~///~~Can a case be made that future manufacturing location and private investment will be favorable to Detroit and not just to the region?

~~///~~What would be the effect on the city's tax base?

Finally it was stated: for the record, it's good to hear that Alternative 2 is consistent with the community improvement plan for Junction Yard that the coalition (CBRA) has submitted as an alternative to be evaluated under the EIS. That took place ten days ago. That is new information to us, because we had previously understood that, if there was no expansion of Junction Yard, there would be no funding to improve the infrastructure surrounding it.

Responses to the above by Joe Corradino indicated that 70 to 90 percent of the outbound shipments at this time involve auto-related activity. Inbound traffic involves all sorts of goods being distributed in the region. He indicated the EIS economic analysis would attempt to address the issue of impacts on host communities, job losses

and gains, the effects on the tax base, and the like. Because forecast demand exceeds capacity, it is the role of government to improve the transportation system for business, industry and the military. That includes improvements to the terminals and outside the terminals. Joe Corradino noted, however, that under Alternative 2, it was unlikely that the truck-only road would be built because there would not be a sufficient concentration of trucks to justify it. Likewise, certain drainage improvements associated with the truck-only road would not then be feasible. But, other improvements are associated with Alternative 2, including adjustments to Central and Lonyo, and better access at I-94 at Livernois.

?? Sarah Lile, head of the Detroit Department of Environmental Affairs, stressed that air quality issues should be evaluated beyond those covered by conformity.

Having concluded inquiries of groups sitting at the table, Greg Johnson asked whether there were any individuals from the public that cared to ask questions or make comments.

?? Mohan Farhat of the Detroit Water and Sewer Department asked whether impacts to water systems would be reflected in the EIS. The response was yes.

?? Josephine Powel of the Department of Environment for Wayne County noted that there are air quality issues of industrial sources that should be included in analysis of impacts generated by the DIFT project. She also stressed environmental justice was another key project issue.

?? Martha Gruelle, Director of Southwest Detroit Environmental Vision and a member of CBRA, made several comments:

~~It~~ It is impossible to understand the scope of Alternative 2 at this time. There are no conceptual layouts. There is nothing to estimate truck traffic on potential truck routes.

~~The~~ The definition of minorities on page 12 of the scoping document is a problem because it does not consider Arabs. The USDOT definition of groups covered by environmental justice provisions does not go far enough.

~~National~~ National security is listed as a major purpose of the project now, after many years of discussion, when there was no mention of the U.S. military earlier.

~~If~~ If Norfolk Southern indeed has a shortfall in terms of capacity, why are they moving Triple Crown and Delray to the Livernois Yard? The big part of the need for the project is based on one company's decisions.

~~Impacts~~ Impacts of air toxics and PM_{2.5} should be considered in terms of lost school days and lost work days, if they aren't included in the EIS as environmental impacts.

~~It~~ It is good to see some air quality analysis will be done for 2015. PM_{2.5} calculations also should be done for 2015.

~~The~~ The people involved in the project's public meetings have heard many times from the residents and elected officials representing Southwest Detroit that the project looks like a disaster for Southwest Detroit, at least Alternative 3.

~~Communities~~ Communities for a Better Rail Alternative is being condemned for being too soft on MDOT, for ever talking with MDOT about alternatives because community members and elected officials say to us the answer is no.

?? Mickey Blashfield, a representative of Centra, asked if the Riverview-Trenton facility would be included in the analysis. Joe Corradino responded that, if his understanding of the Surface Transportation Board's decision is correct, adding the capacity of the Riverview-Trenton facility doesn't diminish the fact that more intermodal capacity is needed in the region.

?? Kathryn Savoie, the representative of ACCESS/CBRA asked if the truck-only road from Springwells is still considered viable. Joe Corradino responded that until there is further analysis, both the Schaefer Road and Springwells truck-only road options are under consideration for Alternative 3, but that the truck-only road was likely not viable based on truck volumes for Alternative 2.

Greg Johnson asked if there were any further questions and he noted that the transcript of the meeting would be available on the Web site.

?? Robert Sills of the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality-Air Quality Division asked again what the scope of analysis would be with respect to $PM_{2.5}$. Would there be only emissions determined or would impacts (concentrations) be estimated? And, what will be included in the EIS? Joe Corradino responded that the analysis will only be of emissions, not concentrations. And, $PM_{2.5}$ would be reported in an appendix to the EIS. Air toxics will be discussed in the EIS on a qualitative basis, using calculations of surrogate pollutants, like volatile organic compounds (VOCs).

?? Paul Max, the representative of the Detroit Department of Public Health, asked if the hospitalization data spoken of earlier were for emergency rooms only. Joe Corradino indicated he believed that those data are for emergency hospitalizations by zip code for two time periods.

The meeting then ended at 12:15 p.m.

I:\projects\2846-a\wp\notes\misc\scopingjune4.rtf

Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project
Scoping Meeting
June 4, 2003, 10:00 a.m.
Northwest Activities Center

Attendance

NAME	COMPANY/AGENCY
<u>Agency Representatives</u>	
Abdelmora Abdalla	FHWA
Heidi Alcock	City Planning Commission
Chris Ammerman	City of Detroit Law Dept.
Fred Berry	Wayne Co. Homeland Security
Don Cameron	FHWA
Michael Darga	Wayne County DPS-Eng
Ken Dobson	Congresswoman Kilpatrick
Karen Dumas	Mayor's Office
Ajere Evans	City of Detroit Mayor's Office
M. Farhat	DWSD
Sherrie Farrell	City of Detroit
Fred Feliciano	Mayor Kilpatrick's Office
Jerry Fulcher	MDEQ-GLMP
Sam Geevarghese	PLD
Christopher Gulock	City Planning Comm.
Ruth Hepfer	FHWA
Robert Johnson	Michigan CIS
Dion Johnson	Mayor's Office
Sherry Kamke	US EPA
Bruce M. King	DEA/City of Detroit
Ken Kucel	Wayne Co. DPS
Tarik Lester	Congresswoman Kilpatrick
Sarah Lile	DEPE/City of Detroit
R. Daryl Lundy	Dept. of Mil. & Vet. Affairs
Juan Jose Martinez	Councilwoman Sheila Cockrel
Paul Max	Detroit Health Dept.
Glenn Osowski	Congressman John Conyers
Josephine Powel	Wayne Co. Dept. of Env.
Samir Ray	PLD

NAME	COMPANY/AGENCY
<u>Agency Representatives</u> (continued)	
Olga Savic	Rep. Steve Tobocman
Robert Sills	Michigan DEQ-AOD
Daljit Singh	DWSD
Donald-Ray Smith	Det. Planning & Dev.
Jim Sype	Mayor's Office
Doug Topolski	Dearborn P.D. Traffic Safety
Chuck Tucker	City of Ferndale
Jacquelyn Watts	Mayor Kilpatrick's Office

Other

Mickey Blashfield	Centra
Mario Ferrini	Ferrini Contracting
Victor Ferrini	Ferrini Contracting
Martha Gruelle	SDEV/CBRA
Karen Kavanaugh	SDBA/CBRA
Joanna Ladki	ACCESS
Kathryn Savoie	ACCESS/CBRA

Staff/Consultant

Ari Adler	TCG
Geralyn Ayers	MDOT
Jeff Edwards	MDOT Metro Region
Tom Hanf	MDOT
Randy Henke	Benesch
Stephanie Litaker	MDOT Communications
Bob Parsons	MDOT
Sherry Piacenti	MDOT
Doug Strauss	Benesch